



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/502,818	02/11/2000	Neelakantan Sundaresan	ARC-00-0004-US1	5719

7590 04/29/2003

Samuel A Kassatly
6819 Trinidad Drive
San Jose, CA 95120

EXAMINER

CHANNAVAJJALA, SRIRAMA T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2177	9

DATE MAILED: 04/29/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Paper No. 9

Application Number: 09/502,818

Filing Date: February 11, 2000

Appellant(s): SUNDARESAN, NEELAKANTAN

MAILED

APR 29 2003

Technology Center 2100

Samuel A. Kassatly
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed on 10 February 2003.

(1) *Real Party in Interest*

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief, page 2 is correct.

(2) *Related Appeals and Interferences*

A statement identifying the related appeals and interferences, which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal is contained in the brief.

(3) *Status of Claims*

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief page 2 is correct.

(4) *Status of Amendments After Final*

No amendment after final has been filed.

(5) *Summary of Invention*

The summary of invention contained in the brief is correct.

(6) *Issues*

The appellant's statement of the issues in the brief page 4 is correct.

(7) *Grouping of Claims*

Appellant's brief includes a statement that claims 1-5,6-10,11-16 and 17-22 are grouped together stand or fall together and provides reasons as set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) and (c)(8).

(8) ClaimsAppealed

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief page 18-22 is correct.

(9) Prior Art of Record

6,363,377	Kravets et al.	03 2002
6,263,332	Nasr et al.	07 2001

(10) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1- 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kravets et al., [hereafter Kravets], US Patent No. 6363377 in view of Nasr et al., [hereafter Nasr], US Patent No. 6263332.

2. As to Claims 1,6,11, 17, Kravets teaches a system which including 'automatically generating dynamic search abstracts' [see Abstract, col 2, line 47-52, line 53-56], fig 11], Kravets teaches search engine for refining, filtering and organizing search queries and search results as detailed in Abstract, especially fig 11 is the query results

Art Unit: 2177

corresponds to abstracts, 'a crawler for crawling documents and acquiring metadata and link information from the documents' [col 1, line 43-53, col 10, line 12-34, line 66-67, col 11, line 1-6], Kravets specifically suggests several web engines such as Alta Vista, Excite, Web Crawler capable of sending programs for example robots or crawlers which automatically peruse the web and gather web pages, automatically indexing the collected web pages as detailed in col 1, line 43-53, also Kravets teaches meta data related to each document that represents conditions to be satisfied in order for a document to be considered a match as detailed in table 2, col 10, line 23-26, 'a metadata repository for storing the metadata acquired by the crawler' [col 1, line 47-55], Kravets suggests search engines store words of a documents corresponds to storing metadata acquired by web Crawler, 'an indexing engine for periodically indexing the metadata and the link information' [col 9, line 10-22, col 6, line 46-63], Kravets specifically teaches Harvest search engine fig 8, element 816 which is configured to index all the pages, examiner interpreting index engine corresponds to Kravets's Harvest search engine as detailed in fig 8, also Kravets teaches generating dynamic set of URLs as detailed in col 9, line 10-12, 'a search engine for applying a search query to the metadata indexed by the indexing engine to generate a preliminary result set containing selected abstracts' [col 10, line 3-34, line 66-67, col 11, line 1-6, fig 4, fig 11], 'search engine inquires if the link repository contains new link information about preliminary result set, and updates the selected abstracts based on the new link information, if any, to generate the dynamic search abstracts' [col 11, line 33-41, col 12, line 6-23, line 42-52]. It is however noted that Kravets does not specifically teach 'an

abstract engine' although Kravets specifically suggests abstract query language that can easily be mapped to any particular engine's language [see col 10, line 13-14]. On the other hand, Nasr teaches a system which including 'an abstract engine' [see fig 1B, element 30, col 3, line 5-10].

It would have been obvious one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Nasr et al., into refining and improving search queries and organizing the results of a search query by different and overlapping criteria of Kravets because they both are directed to query processing, more specifically searching for information on the Web using search engine [see Kravets: Abstract, Nasr: Abstract]. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to modify Kravets's fig 1A to incorporate the teachings of Nasr's Abstract Engine fig 1B, element 30 because that would have allowed users of Kravets's search query system to compile number of similar search quests in a number of differing languages such as detailed in fig 1B, elements 5a-5d, then abstract engine run the search to obtain search results, bringing the advantages of supporting any number of query languages, thus improving the processing of query and validate the results efficiently as suggested by Nasr [see col 2, line 22-24].

3. As to Claims 2,7, 14, 20, Kravets teaches a system which including 'query transformer, which when prompted by the search query, applies a query request to the metadata and the link information indexed by the indexing engine' [col 4, line 66-67, col 5, line 1-2, line 50-56, col 8, line 49-54].

4. As to Claims 3,8,15, 21, Kravets teaches a system which including 'search results transformer that transforms the dynamic search abstracts into a user browsable form' [col 7, line 61-65, col 8, line 18-25].

5. As to Claims 4,9,16,22, Kravets teaches a system which including 'link repository stores persistent link information and maintains a crawl history' [fig 1A, element 11, col 3, line 62-65].

6. As to Claims 5,10, 12, 18, Kravets teaches a system which including 'at least one of the selected abstracts includes information gathered from a source other than a candidate page associated with the selected abstract' [fig 11, col 13, line 21-29].

7. As to Claims 13, 19 Kravets teaches a system which including 'if the link repository does not contain new link information, presenting abstracts previously stored in the link repository' [col 8, line 49-62].

(11) Response to Argument

- a) At page 11, line 8-10, Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection ground is insufficient to show that Kravets teaches "automatically generating dynamic search abstracts"
- b) At page 11, line 14-16, Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Kravets does not address the problems associated with search abstracts, and thus does not resolve these problems.
- c) At page 12, line 7-10, Claim 1, Applicant submits that this reasoning is equally deficient in that it does not specifically show that Kravets teaches "automatically generating dynamic search abstracts".....
- d) At page 12, line 16-17, Claim 1, as a result, the Kravets system cannot be said to be automatic.

As to the above argument [a-d], Examiner disagree with the applicant because firstly, Kravets is directed to search engine for a refining, filtering and organizing search queries and search results [see Abstract, fig 11].

Secondly, Kravets specifically teaches dynamic set of record tokens to restrict the results of a search query that infact, saves users time as well as organize and search queries and documents that satisfy the query [see col 2, line 53-61].

Thirdly, Kravets specifically teaches for example search engine by automatically and selectively modifying individual query terms in users' query as detailed in col 2, line

Art Unit: 2177

47-52, further it is noted that Kravets suggests for example search engines send out programs called robots, or crawlers, which automatically peruse the Web and gather Web pages they discover. The collected pages are automatically indexed and collected into a database. [see col 1, line 47-50], therefore, Kravets teaches said to be automatic.

As best understood by the examiner, search engines are the powerful tools for getting or finding information on the world wide web or WWW, further search tools enables users to access information across internet is well known in the art. It is also noted that due to dynamic nature and number of information sources on the world wide web continuously increasing that makes indexing with keywords or subject titles attributed by human experts virtually impossible, therefore, the task is possible with only automatically generate indexing of information for example popular search services such as AltaVista, Excite, HotBot, InfoSeek, Lycos, NorthemLight and like as discussed by Kravets et al., in the background of the invention [see Kravets :col 1, line 45-50] and well known in the art.

Further in the previous office action, examiner clearly stated that Kravets et al., teaches search engine for refining, filtering and organizing search queries and search results as detailed in the Abstract, especially fig 11 is an example of search results that corresponds to abstracts, therefore, Kravets teaches automatically generating dynamic search abstracts.

Art Unit: 2177

e) At page 13, line 12-15, Applicant admits that the use of abstract engines was known prior to the filing of the present application, and thus make no claim as to the abstract engines per se. Rather, Applicant is claiming the combination of the novel features recited in Claim 1.

f) At page 13, line 16-18, Applicant further submits that the office action did not provide a justifiable reason.....

As to the above arguments [e-f], Examiner noted that Applicant admits that the use of abstract engines was known prior to the filing of the present application [page 10, line 1 page 13, line 12-13], especially Nasr et al., prior art does teach abstract engine In the previous office action examiner stated that Kravets et al., does not teach 'abstract engine', but at the same time not only Kravets et al. specifically teaches various search engines that automatically generate indexing of information for example popular search services such as AltaVista, Excite, HotBot, InfoSeek, Lycos, NorthernLight but also Kravets et al suggests abstract query language that can easily be mapped to any particular engine's language [col 10, line 13-14], further Kravets also suggests for example most search engines, there are two types of data that the user can input: content that is to be matched to the text of documents, and structure, or meta data, related to each document that represents conditions to be satisfied in order for a document to be considered a match, for example in the AltaVista query shown in table 2 [see col 10, line 15-34].

On the other hand, Nasr specifically teaches 'abstract engine' [see fig 1B, element 30, col 3, line 5-10], abstract engine corresponds to Nasr's fig 1B, element 30. It is also noted that both Kravets and Nasr teach abstract language related to search query [see Kravets: col 10, line 13-14; Nasr: fig 1B, col 3, line 7-10]

Therefore, It would have been obvious one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Nasr et al., into refining and improving search queries and organizing the results of a search query by different and overlapping criteria of Kravets because they both are directed to query processing, more specifically searching for information on the Web using search engine [see Kravets: Abstract, Nasr: Abstract], also teaches abstract language related to search query [see Kravets: col 10, line 13-14; Nasr: fig 1B, col 3, line 7-10] and both are from same field of endeavor.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to modify Kravets's fig 1A to incorporate the teachings of Nasr's Abstract Engine fig 1B, element 30 because that would have allowed users of Kravets's search query system to compile number of similar search quests in a number of differing languages such as detailed in fig 1B, elements 5a-5d, then abstract engine run the search to obtain search results, bringing the advantages of supporting any number of query languages, thus improving the processing of query and validate the results efficiently as suggested by Nasr [see col 2, line 22-24].

g) At page 14, line 11-14, Claim 1, applicant submits that the foregoing group is untenable since it still does not clarify how" a search engine that dynamically filtering organizing.....link information

h) At page 15, line 8-9, Claim 1, Kravets does not acquire link information.

As to the above arguments [g-h], examiner disagree with the applicant because firstly Kravets teaches search engine that dynamically filtering, organizing documents [see Abstract, col 9, line 10-13, line 22-26], as best understood by the examiner Harvest search engine collects, indexing information, further Harvest search engine intended to be a scalable form of infrastructure for building and distributing content, indexing information as well as for accessing web information. At minimum, Kravets suggests using Harvest search engine element 816, the output set 818 from Harvest S1, is processed against the flag array by dynamic filter element 824 and the intersection is returned. The algorithm also filters out duplicates [see col 9, line 22-26]

Secondly, Kravet suggests for example fig 5 is directed to URL lens, more specifically URL lens element 510 similar documents, in other words, URL lens finds other URLs that contain the terms or links as detailed in col 6, line 46-63]. As best understood by the examiner, Kravet suggests when the user chooses cell for example 534,536 that gives linking information that may be related to corresponding information is still part of URL lens as detailed in fig 5.

- i) At page 15, line 16-18, Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection ground, and submits that Kravets' indexing engine does not index link information....
- j) At page 16, line 4-8, Claim 1, applicant traverses this rejection ground, and submits that the URLs generated by Kravets represent the pages visited "last week" and as result, these URLs are not the same as, or equivalent to "new link information.....

As to the above arguments [I-j], Kravets suggests using Harvest search engine which is configured to index all the pages, [see fig 8, element 816], examiner interpreting index engine corresponds to Kravets' Harvest search engine because Harvest engine return pages from its index [col 9, line 18-19]. As best understood by the examiner Harvest system consists of several subsystems for example Harvest search system is capable of not only collects indexing information but also other subsystems provide the flexible interface to this information, further Harvest engine is intended to be a scalable form of infrastructure for building and distributing content, indexing information as well as for accessing Web or internet information. It is also noted that Kravets suggests hierarchy forest defined on all the meta-data of a query, where each tree contains meta-data that is having relationship to other meta data as suggested in fig 9, specifically fig 9(a) is an example of structural meta-data of a document in the form of natural hierarchical list from the tags, [see col 10, line 66-67, col 11, line 1-6], further Kravets also suggests hierarchical list form the tags that specify the prominent information in the document such as title, to tags, text and like that corresponds to link information [col 11, line 1-14], it is to be noted new link information is

not only part of meta-data, but also part of dynamic filtering process because Kravets at minimum suggests dynamic filtering implemented anywhere one desires to restrict/filter one set of URLs by another set of URLs [col 9, line 27-29]. It is however, noted that both Kravets et al. and Nasr et al. directed to querying, specifically searching information on the internet, as best understood by the examiner, a location on the Internet containing one or more text, graphical images and including for navigating through various websites that typically contain links to other web sites [see Kravets: fig 4, fig 11, col 1, line 47-49]. It is also noted that A link consists of a webpage address in the form of a Uniform Resource Locator or URL such as detailed in Kravets fig 4, fig 11, further a relative link(s) consist of the relative path from the current webpage to the linked-to-webpage, for example see fig 11, a webpage may link to another, webpage by embedding within its HTML the address, in the form of the URL, of the other webpage, a particular URL uniquely identifies a particular webpage and well known in the art, therefore, new link information is integral part of Kravets et al. teaching.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,


Srirama Channavajjala
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2177

sc
April 25, 2003

Conferees


John E. Breene
SPE/AU 2177


Alam, Hosain
Primary Examiner, AU2172

Samuel A Kassatly
6819 Trinidad Drive
San Jose, CA 95120